THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.ESWARAIAH

WRIT PETITION No.3871 of 2006

Between:

Maddineni Guttaiah.

.. PETITIONER

and

The Sub-Inspector of Police,
and others.

..
RESPONDENTS

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

ORDER:

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned

Government Pleader for Home appearing on behalf of respondents 1 to 3.

It is the case of the petitioner that he is a resident of Garla Bayyaram Village and Mandal, Khammam District. He is working as Vaartha News Paper reporter since 1996.

It is stated that the petitioner has reported a news item with regard to the death of a constable and also the atrocities of the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Yellanda and the Inspector of Police, Garla Bayyaram, and also reported a news item stating that a case has been registered against the police as they have committed atrocities on the tribals. The police bore grudge against the petitioner and registered cases in Cr.No.89 of 2005, S.T.C.No.140 of 2004 and Cr.No.59 of 2004 and the respondents are harassing the petitioner to produce photos for opening rowdy sheet against the petitioner. Therefore, he seeks direction to the respondents not to harass the petitioner and not to insist upon the petitioner to produce photos for the purpose of opening a rowdy sheet.

A counter has been filed by the respondents stating that the petitioner, who is working as News Reporter of Vaartha News Paper, worked in CPI (ML) Pyla Vasudeva Rao Group, now called as New Democracy party, and involved in several cases. Out of which, Cr.Nos.15/1985, 9/1986 and 10/1986 were ended in acquittal as the witnesses did not depose their evidence due to fear of underground extremists. At present, two cases are pending against the petitioner i.e., Cr.No.59 of 2004 for the offences under Sections 307, 506, 294 (b), 323 IPC and 156 (3) Cr.P.C. and Cr.No.89 of 2005 for the offences under Sections 143 and 447 read with 149 IPC.

It is further contended that as the petitioner has involved in number of cases and two cases are pending against him, after getting permission from the Superintendent of Police, Khammam, a rowdy sheet was opened

against the petitioner on 11-02-2006. Since the rowdy sheet was opened, the petitioner was asked to produce photos for the purpose of affixing in the rowdy sheet. It is also stated that the respondents never harassed the petitioner nor any of his family members as alleged by the petitioner.

In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, it is to be seen that two cases are pending against the petitioner and a rowdy sheet has already been opened against him.

Therefore, I do not see any merits in this writ petition and the same is liable to be dismissed.

The writ petition is, accordingly, dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

_____

02-03-2007

Prv